



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/508,617	03/14/2000	KOJI IDEI	000225	8477

23850 7590 08/23/2005

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP  
1725 K STREET, NW  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1774

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/508,617

Applicant(s)

IDEI ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence D. Ferguson

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed June 15, 2005.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are pending in this case.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujioka et al. (U.S. 4,279,961).

Fujioka discloses a recording material with a base sheet (abstract) where a coating is applied to the base sheet comprising cationic resins, such as quaternary ammonium salts, a surface resistivity of  $10^6$  to  $10^{10}$  ohms and 2 to 20 g/m<sup>2</sup> by dry weight (column 5, lines 33-44) where the resistivity is higher in an atmosphere of lower humidity (column 1, lines 39-48). Fujioka further discloses coating a paper (column 8, lines 9-11).

In instant claim 1, the phrase “as measured by colloidal titration method” introduces a process limitation to the product claim. The patentability of a product does

Art Unit: 1774

not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Further, process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Although Fujioka teaches the recording material can be used in copying machines and other printers (column 1, lines 9-19) the reference does not explicitly disclose it is used for ink jet and electrophotographic recording. The phrase, "for ink jet and electrophotographic recording" is an intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Because Fujioka discloses a paper comprising the same cationic resin (quaternary ammonium salt) and surface resistivity as instantly claimed, the cation equivalent is an inherent feature. The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Mere recitation of newly-discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in prior art, does not cause claim drawn to those things to distinguish over prior art. The Patent Office can require applicant to prove that subject matter shown to be in prior art

Art Unit: 1774

does not possess characteristic relied on where it has reason to believe that functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in claimed subject matter may be inherent characteristic of prior art; this burden of proof is applicable to product and process claims reasonably considered as possessing allegedly inherent characteristics.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka et al. (U.S. 4,279,961) in view of Shepherd (U.S. 4,207,142).

Fujioka is relied upon for claim 1 as above. Although Fujioka does not explicitly teach making the paper from pulp, it would have been obvious for the paper to contain pulp because paper is conventionally made from pulp. Fujioka does not teach the paper having a neutral rosin sizing agent or alkenyl succinic anhydride as an internal sizing agent. Shepherd teaches paper sizing materials consisting of rosin (column 1, lines 18-20) and alkenyl succinic anhydride sizing agents (column 2, lines 45-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a rosin or alkenyl succinic anhydride sizing agent in the paper of Fujioka because Shepherd teaches the sizing

Art Unit: 1774

agents impart to paper good resistance to acidic liquids and do not detract from the strength of the paper and can increase the strength of the finished sheets (column 13, lines 48-60).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujioka et al. (U.S. 4,279,961) has been considered but is unpersuasive. Applicant argues that merely because Fujioka discloses a paper comprising the same cationic resin and surface resistivity claimed it does not follow that the cation equivalent measured by the colloidal titration method is inherent. Examiner maintains that the cation equivalent measured by the colloidal titration method is an inherent feature of Fujioka, as Applicant has not shown why it is not inherent. The Patent Office can require applicant to prove that subject matter shown to be in prior art does not possess characteristic relied on where it has reason to believe that functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in claimed subject matter may be inherent characteristic of prior art; this burden of proof is applicable to product and process claims reasonably considered as possessing allegedly inherent characteristics. Applicant further argues the portion of Fujioka quoted (column 5, lines 33-44) relates to an intermediate product and not the final product. Because the material is used to make the invention, the cationic resins, such as quaternary ammonium salts, surface resistivity of  $10^6$  to  $10^{10}$  ohms and 2 to 20 g/m<sup>2</sup> by dry weight (column 5, lines 33-44) are present in the final product of the invention.

Art Unit: 1774

Applicant argues the phrase, "as measured by colloidal titration method" is not a product by process limitation as it specifies the cation equivalent of the cationic resin. The cationic equivalent of 3-8 meq/g has not been called a product by process limitation, but the phrase, "as measured by colloidal titration method" introduces a process limitation to the product claim. Examiner maintains process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. Applicant further argues that the use of a waste paper pulp is essential in claim 4. Although Fujioka does not explicitly teach making the paper from pulp, it would have been obvious for the paper to contain pulp because paper is conventionally made from pulp, which is inclusive of waste paper pulp.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1774


Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



L. Ferguson  
Patent Examiner  
AU 1774



RENA DYE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A.U. 1774 8/18/05